arXiv:0806.3449v1 [math.AP] 20 Jun 2008

Shape derivative of potential energy and energy release rate in fracture mechanics

Masato Kimura* and Isao Wakano**

* *Faculty of Mathematics, Kyushu University, masato@math.kyushu-u.ac.jp*
** *Graduate School of Informatics, Kyoto University, wakano@i.kyoto-u.ac.jp*

Abstract

We study general mathematical framework for variation of potential energy with respect to domain deformation. It enables rigorous derivation of the integral formulas for the energy release rate in crack problems. Applying a technique of the shape sensitivity analysis, we formulate the shape derivative of potential energy as a variational problem with a parameter. Key tools of our abstract theory are a new parameter variational principle and the classical implicit function theorem in Banach spaces.

Keywords: shape derivative, variational principle, energy release rate, fracture mechanics

Mathematics Subject Classification (2000): 35J20, 74G65, 74R10

1 Introduction

Many variational problems related to the domain deformation have been investigated in the theory of shape derivatives or the shape sensitivity analysis ([9], [15]). According to the spread of the importance of shape derivatives in various scientific fields, more development of their mathematical foundation has been required. The purpose of this paper is to establish some abstract parameter variational formulas and their application to the shape derivative of potential energies. An important example is the energy release rate in crack problems, which is known as one of the most fundamental quantities in the theory of fracture mechanics.

Scientific investigation to understand crack evolution process in elastic body was originated by Griffith [6] and has been studied from various viewpoints in engineering, physics and mathematics since then. Griffith's idea in the fracture mechanics is even now the fundamental theory in modeling and analysis of the crack behavior. We here make reference to only very few extended studies from mathematical point of view, Cherepanov [3], Rice [14], Ohtsuka [10], [11], [12], Ohtsuka-Khludnev [13], and Francfort-Marigo [5]. For more complete list of crack problems and fracture mechanics, please see the references in the above papers.

In the Griffith's theory and its various extended theories such as [5], the concept of the energy release rate G plays an important role. According to such theories, we treat crack evolutions in brittle materials with linear elasticity under a quasi-static situation, in which applied boundary loading is supposed to change slowly and any inertial effect can be ignored. The elastic energy at a fixed moment is supposed to be given by minimization of an elastostatic energy. According to the Griffith's theory, the surface energy required in the crack evolution is supplied by relaxation of the potential energy along crack growth.

Roughly speaking, the energy release rate G is defined as follows. Please see the above references for more precise definition. Let Ω_* be a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$ ($n \geq 2$), which corresponds to the uncracked material under consideration. We assume that a crack Σ exist in Ω_*, where Σ is the closure of an $n-1$ dimensional hypersurface. The cracked elastic body is represented by $\Omega_* \setminus \Sigma$. We consider a virtual crack extension $\Sigma(t)$ with parameter $t \in [0, T)$, where $\Sigma = \Sigma(0) \subset \Sigma(t_1) \subset \Sigma(t_2)$ $(0 \leq^\forall t_1 \leq^\forall t_2 < T)$.

Under the quasi-static assumption, the elastic potential energy $E(t)$ in $\Omega(t) := \Omega_* \setminus \Sigma(t)$ is given by

$$E(t) := \min_v \int_{\Omega_* \setminus \Sigma(t)} W(x, v(x), \nabla v(x)) dx, \tag{1.1}$$

where by $W(x, v(x), \nabla v(x))$ the potential energy density including a body force is denoted, and $\min_v$ is taken over all possible displacement fields in $\Omega_* \setminus \Sigma(t)$ with a given boundary condition. For the admissible displacement fields, a given displacement field is imposed only on the part $\Gamma_D \subset \partial\Omega_*$. On the other part $\partial\Omega(t) \setminus \Gamma_D$ including both sides of $\Sigma(t)$, the normal stress free condition is imposed for the minimizer on $\partial\Omega(t)$ implicitly.

The energy release rate G at $t = 0$ along the virtual crack extension $\{\Sigma(t)\}_{0 \leq t < T}$ is given by

$$G := \lim_{t \to +0} \frac{E(0) - E(t)}{|\Sigma(t) \setminus \Sigma|}. \tag{1.2}$$

Since $E(t) \leq E(0)$, $G \geq 0$ follows if the limit exists. The Griffith's criterion for the brittle crack extension is given by $G \geq G_c$, where G_c is an energy required to create new crack per unit length and it is a constant depending on the material property and the position.

Cherepanov [3] and Rice [14] studied so-called J-integral for straight crack in two dimensional linear elasticity, which is a path-independent integral expressions of the energy release rate. Since these works, theoretical and practical studies of crack evolutions have been much developed by means of such useful mathematical expression of G in two dimensional case.

As an alternative approach to such energy based arguments, Irwin [8] proposed the notions of fracture toughness and stress intensity factors and he developed arguments based on the singularity of stress fields.

While most of these mathematically rigorous results have been restricted to two dimensional linear elasticity (and often only for straight cracks), Ohtsuka [10], [11], [12] and Ohtsuka-Khludnev [13] developed a mathematical formulation of the energy release rate for general curved cracks in multi-dimensional linear or semi-linear elliptic systems. They proved existence of the energy release rate, and obtained its expression by a domain integral and by a generalized J-integral.

Based on the idea in [11], we shall give a new mathematical framework for shape derivative of potential energy including the energy release rate. Adopting domain perturbation φ of Lipschitz class, we treat the shape derivative as an abstract parameter variation problem in Banach spaces, where φ is considered as a parameter belonging to a Lipschitz class. Instead of estimating the limit (1.2) directly as in [11] and [13], we treat it by means of the Fréchet derivative.

In our approach, the shape derivative of minimum potential energy is derived as a Fréchet derivative in a Banach space within an abstract parameter variation formulas and it is given as a domain integral. The key tools in the abstract parameter variation setting are the implicit function theorem and the Lax-Milgram theorem.

The organization of this paper is as follows. Abstract parameter variation formulas are established based on the implicit function theorem in Banach spaces in Section 2. In Section 3, a framework of Lipschitz deformation of domains, which includes crack extensions, is introduced. Minimization problems with a general potential energy in deformed domains are studied in Section 4 as an application of the abstract parameter variation formulas in Section 2. Quadratic energy functionals corresponding to second order linear elliptic equations are treated in Section 5. Under a weak regularity assumption, we show the existence of the shape derivative of the minimum potential energy and derive its domain integral expression and a boundary integral formula (J-integral). The results obtained there include the results in [11] and [13] under a weaker assumption for regularity of domain perturbation. In [13], they assumed that the domain perturbation $t \to \varphi(t)$ belongs to $C^2([0,T], W^{2,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)^n)$ and derived the domain integral expression, whereas, in Theorem 5.5, we prove it under a weaker assumption $\varphi \in C^1([0,T], W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)^n)$. For simplicity, description will be made on scalar equation in Sections 4 and 5. But our results are easily extended to elliptic systems such as linear elasticity problems as shown in [11].

2 Parameter variation formulas

We consider a variational problem with a parameter in an abstract setting. For a real valued functional J defined on a metric space S, $u_0 \in S$ is called a *global minimizer* of J in S, if $J(u_0) \leq J(u)$ for all $u \in S$. If there exists an open set $\mathcal{O} \subset S$ and u_0 is a global minimizer of J in $\mathcal{O}$, $u_0 \in S$ is called a *local minimizer* of J.

Let X and M be real Banach spaces. For open subsets $\mathcal{U}_0 \subset X$ and $\mathcal{O}_0 \subset M$, we consider $J \in C^1(\mathcal{U}_0 \times \mathcal{O}_0, \mathbb{R})$ and $u \in C^1(\mathcal{O}_0, \mathcal{U}_0)$. We assume that $u(\mu)$ is a local minimizer of $J(\cdot, \mu)$ in $\mathcal{U}_0$ for each $\mu \in \mathcal{O}_0$, and define $J_*(\mu) := J(u(\mu), \mu)$ for $\mu \in \mathcal{O}_0$. Then we have $J_* \in C^1(\mathcal{O}_0)$ and

$$J_*'(\mu) = D_\mu[J(u(\mu), \mu)] = \partial_X J(u(\mu), \mu)[u'(\mu)] + \partial_M J(u(\mu), \mu) = \partial_M J(u(\mu), \mu), \tag{2.1}$$

where J_*' denotes the Fréchet derivative of J_* and D_μ denotes the Fréchet differential operator with respect to $\mu \in M$. The symbols ∂_X and ∂_M denote the partial Fréchet derivative operators for $J(u, \mu)$ with respect to $u \in X$ and $\mu \in M$, respectively. The last equality of (2.1) follows from $\partial_X J(u(\mu), \mu) = 0 \in X'$, where X' denotes the dual space of X. The formula

$$J_*'(\mu) = \partial_M J(u(\mu), \mu) \qquad (\mu \in \mathcal{O}_0), \tag{2.2}$$

is a simple but essential equation in this paper.

The following fundamental theorem states that the formula (2.2) is derived under a weaker assumption for regularity.

Theorem 2.1. *Let X and M be real Banach spaces. For $\mathcal{U}_0 \subset X$ and an open subset $\mathcal{O}_0 \subset M$, we consider a real valued functional $J : \mathcal{U}_0 \times \mathcal{O}_0 \to \mathbb{R}$ and a map $u : \mathcal{O}_0 \to \mathcal{U}_0$. We define $J_*(\mu) := J(u(\mu), \mu)$ for $\mu \in \mathcal{O}_0$. We suppose the following conditions.*

1. *$J \in C^0(\mathcal{U}_0 \times \mathcal{O}_0)$, $J(w, \cdot) \in C^1(\mathcal{O}_0)$ for $w \in \mathcal{U}_0$, and $\partial_M J \in C^0(\mathcal{U}_0 \times \mathcal{O}_0, M')$.*
2. *$u \in C^0(\mathcal{O}_0, X)$ and $u(\mu)$ is a global minimizer of $J(\cdot, \mu)$ in $\mathcal{U}_0$ for each $\mu \in \mathcal{O}_0$.*

Then $J_* \in C^1(\mathcal{O}_0)$ and (2.2) holds.

Proof. We fix $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{O}_0$ and we define $u_0 := u(\mu_0)$ and

$$r(\mu) := J_*(\mu) - J_*(\mu_0) - \partial_M J(u_0, \mu_0)[\mu - \mu_0] \qquad (\mu \in \mathcal{O}_0).$$

Since $u(\mu)$ is a global minimizer and $u \in C^0(\mathcal{O}_0, X)$, if μ is close to μ_0, we have

$$r(\mu) \leq J(u_0, \mu) - J(u_0, \mu_0) - \partial_M J(u_0, \mu_0)[\mu - \mu_0] = o(\|\mu - \mu_0\|_M),$$

$$\begin{aligned} r(\mu) &\geq J(u(\mu),\mu) - J(u(\mu),\mu_0) - \partial_M J(u_0,\mu_0)[\mu-\mu_0] \\ &= \int_0^1 \{\partial_M J(u(\mu),\mu_0+s(\mu-\mu_0)) - \partial_M J(u_0,\mu_0)\}[\mu-\mu_0]ds = o(\|\mu-\mu_0\|_M). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $r(\mu) = o(\|\mu-\mu_0\|_M)$ as $\mu \to \mu_0$, and we obtain the formula (2.2) and $J'_* \in C^0(\mathcal{O}_0, M')$. ☐

Corollary 2.2. *Under the condition of Theorem 2.1, we assume that* $\mathcal{U}_0$ *is open. If* $\partial_M J \in C^k(\mathcal{U}_0 \times \mathcal{O}_0, M')$ *and* $u \in C^k(\mathcal{O}_0, X)$*, then* $J_* \in C^{k+1}(\mathcal{O}_0)$*.*

Proof. This immediately follows from the formula (2.2). ☐

We apply the implicit function theorem in Banach spaces below. The proof is found in [2] and [7] etc. For two Banach spaces X and Y, $B(X,Y)$ denotes the Banach space which consists of all bounded linear operators from X to Y.

Theorem 2.3 (Implicit function theorem)**.** *Let* X*,* Y*,* Z *be real Banach spaces and* U*,* V *be open sets in* X *and* Y*, respectively. We suppose that* $F : U \times V \to Z$ *and* $(x_0,y_0) \in U \times V$ *satisfy the conditions;*

1. $F(x_0,y_0) = 0$.
2. $F \in C^0(U \times V, Z)$.
3. $F(x,\cdot) \in C^1(V,Z)$ *for* $x \in U$ *and* $\partial_Y F$ *is continuous at* $(x,y) = (x_0,y_0)$*.*
4. $(\partial_Y F(x_0,y_0))^{-1} \in B(Z,Y)$.

Then there exist a convex open neighborhood of (x_0,y_0)*,* $U_0 \times V_0 \subset U \times V$ *and* $f \in C^0(U_0,V_0)$*, such that, for* $(x,y) \in U_0 \times V_0$*,* $F(x,y) = 0$ *if and only if* $y = f(x)$*. Moreover, if* $F \in C^k(U \times V, Z)$ $(k \in \mathbb{N})$*, then* $f \in C^k(U_0,V_0)$*.*

From Theorem 2.1 and the implicit function theorem, we get the following theorems.

Theorem 2.4. *Let* X *and* M *be real Banach spaces and* $\mathcal{U}$ *and* $\mathcal{O}$ *be open subsets of* X *and* M*, respectively. We consider a real valued functional* $J : \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{O} \to \mathbb{R}$ *and fix* $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{O}$*. We assume*

1. $J(\cdot,\mu) \in C^2(\mathcal{U})$ *for* $\mu \in \mathcal{O}$ *and* $\partial_X J \in C^0(\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{O}, X')$*.*
2. $u_0 \in \mathcal{U}$ *satisfies* $\partial_X J(u_0,\mu_0) = 0$*.*
3. $\partial_X^2 J$ *is continuous at* $(w,\mu) = (u_0,\mu_0)$*.*
4. *There exists* $\alpha > 0$ *such that* $\partial_X^2 J(u_0,\mu_0)[w,w] \geq \alpha\|w\|_X^2$ *for* $w \in X$*.*

Then there exist a convex open neighborhood of (u_0,μ_0)*,* $\mathcal{U}_0 \times \mathcal{O}_0 \subset \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{O}$ *and* $u \in C^0(\mathcal{O}_0,\mathcal{U}_0)$*, such that, for* $\mu \in \mathcal{O}_0$*, the following three conditions are equivalent.*

a. $w \in \mathcal{U}_0$ *is a local minimizer of* $J(\cdot,\mu)$

b. $w \in \mathcal{U}_0$ *satisfies* $\partial_X J(w,\mu) = 0$*.*

c. $w = u(\mu)$*.*
In this case, $u(\mu)$ *is a global minimizer of* $J(\cdot,\mu)$ *on* $\mathcal{U}_0$*.*

Proof. We define a map $F := \partial_X J$ from $\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{O}$ to X' and apply Theorem 2.3 at $(w, \mu) = (u_0, \mu_0)$. From assumption 4 and the Lax-Milgram theorem, $\partial_X F(u_0, \mu_0) = \partial_X^2 J(u_0, \mu_0)$ becomes a linear topological isomorphism from X to X'. Then, from the implicit function theorem there exist a convex open neighborhood of (u_0, μ_0), $\mathcal{U}_0 \times \mathcal{O}_0 \subset \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{O}$ and $u \in C^0(\mathcal{O}_0, U_0)$, such that, for $\mu \in \mathcal{O}_0$, $w \in \mathcal{U}_0$ satisfies $\partial_X J(w, \mu) = 0$ if and only if $w = u(\mu)$.

From the continuity of $\partial_X^2 J$ at (u_0, μ_0), without loss of generality, (after replacing $\mathcal{U}_0$ and $\mathcal{O}_0$ with smaller ones if needed) we can assume that

$$\partial_X^2 J(v, \mu)[w, w] \geq \frac{\alpha}{2} \|w\|_X^2 \qquad ({}^\forall w \in X,\ {}^\forall (v, \mu) \in \mathcal{U}_0 \times \mathcal{O}_0). \tag{2.3}$$

For $\mu \in \mathcal{O}_0$, if $w \in \mathcal{U}_0$ is a local minimizer of $J(\cdot, \mu)$ in $\mathcal{U}_0$, the $\partial_X J(w, \mu) = 0$ follows. Conversely, if $w \in \mathcal{U}_0$ satisfies $\partial_X J(w, \mu) = 0$, w is a local minimizer in $\mathcal{U}_0$ from the condition (2.3). It also follows from (2.3) that $u(\mu)$ is a global minimizer of $J(\cdot, \mu)$ in $\mathcal{U}_0$. □

Theorem 2.5. *Under the condition of Theorem 2.4, we additionally assume that* $\partial_X J \in C^k(\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{O}, X')$ *for some* $k \in \mathbb{N}$. *Then* $u \in C^k(\mathcal{O}_0, \mathcal{U}_0)$ *holds.*

Proof. The assertion follows from the implicit function theorem. □

Under the condition of Theorem 2.4, we define

$$J_*(\mu) := J(u(\mu), \mu) \qquad (\mu \in \mathcal{O}_0).$$

As a consequence of Theorem 2.5, a sufficient condition for $J_* \in C^1(\mathcal{O}_0)$ is $J \in C^1(\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{O})$ and $\partial_X J \in C^1(\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{O}, X')$. However, the condition $\partial_X J \in C^1(\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{O}, X')$ is not necessary due to Theorem 2.1.

Theorem 2.6. *Under the condition of Theorem 2.4, we additionally assume that* $J \in C^k(\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{O})$ *for some* $k \in \mathbb{N}$, *then* $J_* \in C^k(\mathcal{O}_0)$ *and it satisfies* (2.2).

Proof. From Theorem 2.1, $J_* \in C^1(\mathcal{O}_0)$ and (2.2) immediately follows. Since $u \in C^{k-1}(\mathcal{O}_0, X)$ follows from Theorem 2.5, $J_* \in C^k(\mathcal{O}_0)$ is obtained from the formula (2.2). □

Let us consider the case $k = 1$ in Theorem 2.6, where $J_* \in C^1(\mathcal{O}_0)$ is derived under the conditions $J \in C^1(\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{O})$ and $J(\cdot, \mu) \in C^2(\mathcal{U})$. In this case, $u \in C^0(\mathcal{O}_0, \mathcal{U}_0)$ holds from Theorem 2.4 but $u \notin C^1(\mathcal{O}_0, \mathcal{U}_0)$ in general. In order to obtain $u \in C^1(\mathcal{O}_0, \mathcal{U}_0)$, we need to assume $\partial_X J \in C^1(\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{O}, X')$ (Theorem 2.5). We have Hölder regularity of u under the condition of Theorem 2.6 with $k = 1$.

Proposition 2.7. *Under the condition of Theorem 2.4, we additionally assume that* $J \in C^1(\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{O})$, *then we have*

$$\|u(\mu) - u_0\|_X = o\left(\|\mu - \mu_0\|_M^{1/2}\right) \qquad \text{as} \ \ \|\mu - \mu_0\|_M \to 0.$$

Proof. From the proof of Theorem 2.3, there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\|u(\mu) - u_0\|_X \leq C \|\partial_X J(u_0, \mu)\|_{X'} \quad (\mu \in \mathcal{O}_0). \tag{2.4}$$

Let $\rho_0 > 0$ with $\{v \in X;\ \|v - u_0\|_X \leq \rho_0\} \subset \mathcal{U}_0$. For $h \in X$ with $\|h\|_X = 1$, $\mu \in \mathcal{O}_0$ and $\rho \in (0, \rho_0]$, we have

$$J(u_0 + \rho h, \mu) = J(u_0, \mu) + \rho \partial_X J(u_0, \mu)[h] + \rho^2 \int_0^1 (1 - s) \partial_X^2 J(u_0 + s\rho h, \mu)[h, h] ds.$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_X J(u_0,\mu)[h] \\
&\quad= \partial_X J(u_0,\mu)[h] - \partial_X J(u_0,\mu_0)[h] \\
&\quad= \left\{\rho^{-1}(J(u_0+\rho h,\mu) - J(u_0,\mu)) - \rho\int_0^1 (1-s)\partial_X^2 J(u_0+s\rho h,\mu)[h,h]ds\right\} \\
&\qquad - \left\{\rho^{-1}(J(u_0+\rho h,\mu_0) - J(u_0,\mu_0)) - \rho\int_0^1 (1-s)\partial_X^2 J(u_0+s\rho h,\mu_0)[h,h]ds\right\} \\
&\quad= \rho^{-1}\int_0^1 \{\partial_M J(u_0+\rho h,\mu_0+t(\mu-\mu_0)) - \partial_M J(u_0,\mu_0+t(\mu-\mu_0))\}[\mu-\mu_0]dt \\
&\qquad -\rho\int_0^1 (1-s)\{\partial_X^2 J(u_0+s\rho h,\mu) - \partial_X^2 J(u_0+s\rho h,\mu_0)\}[h,h]ds
\end{aligned}$$

For $r>0$, we define

$$S(r) := \left\{(w,\lambda)\in X\times M;\ \|w-u_0\|_X \le r, \|\lambda-\mu_0\|_M \le r^2\right\},$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\omega(r) \;:=\; & \sup_{(w,\lambda)\in S(r)} \|\partial_M J(w,\lambda) - \partial_M J(u_0,\mu_0)\|_{M'} \\
& + \sup_{(w,\lambda)\in S(r)} \|\partial_X^2 J(w,\lambda) - \partial_X^2 J(u_0,\mu_0)\|_{B_2(X,\mathbb{R})}.
\end{aligned}$$

We remark that $\omega(r)\to 0$ as $r\to +0$. Choosing $\rho := \|\mu-\mu_0\|_M^{1/2}$, we obtain

$$\|\partial_X J(u_0,\mu)\|_{X'} \le 2\omega(\rho)\rho \qquad (\mu\in\mathcal{O}_0,\ \|\mu-\mu_0\|_M \le \rho_0^2).$$

Hence, from (2.4), we have

$$\|u(\mu)-u_0\|_X \le C\|\partial_X J(u_0,\mu)\|_{X'} \le 2C\omega(\rho)\rho = o(\rho).$$

□

Under the conditions of Theorem 2.4, $\partial_X^2 J(u(\mu),\mu)$ can be regarded as a linear topological isomorphism from X to X' from the Lax-Milgram theorem. Therefore, we can define $\Lambda(\mu)\in B(X',X)$ which satisfies

$$\partial_X^2 J(u(\mu),\mu)[\Lambda(\mu)h,w] = h[w] \qquad (^\forall w\in X,\ ^\forall h\in X').$$

The Fréchet derivative of the local minimizer $u(\mu)$ with respect to parameter μ is given by the next proposition.

Proposition 2.8. *Under the condition of Theorem 2.5 with $k=1$,*

$$u'(\mu) = -\Lambda(\mu)h_0(\mu) \qquad (\mu\in\mathcal{O}_0), \tag{2.5}$$

holds, where $h_0(\mu) := \partial_M\partial_X J(u(\mu),\mu)\in B(M,X')$.

Proof. Differentiating $\partial_X J(u(\mu),\mu) = 0\in X'$ by μ, we have

$$\partial_X^2 J(u(\mu),\mu)[u'(\mu)] + \partial_M\partial_X J(u(\mu),\mu) = 0 \in B(M,X').$$

This is equivalent to (2.5) from the Lax-Milgram theorem. □

Proposition 2.9. *Under the condition of Theorem 2.4, we additionally assume that $J\in C^2(\mathcal{U}\times\mathcal{O})$ then $J_*\in C^2(\mathcal{O}_0)$ and it satisfies*

$$J_*''(\mu)[\mu_1,\mu_2] = \partial_M^2 J(u(\mu),\mu)[\mu_1,\mu_2] - {}_X\langle\Lambda(\mu)h_0(\mu)[\mu_1],\ h_0(\mu)[\mu_2]\rangle_{X'},$$

for $\mu\in\mathcal{O}_0$ and $\mu_1,\mu_2\in M$.

Proof. Differentiating the formula (2.2) by μ and substituting (2.5), we obtain the formula. □

3 Lipschitz deformation of domains

We study a domain deformation with Lipschitz transform $\varphi : \Omega \to \varphi(\Omega)$, where Ω is a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$ ($n \in \mathbb{N}$) and φ is a $\mathbb{R}^n$-valued Lipschitz function. The identity map on $\mathbb{R}^n$ is denoted by $\varphi_0(x) = x$ ($x \in \mathbb{R}^n$).

For a function $u : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^k$, we define

$$|u|_{\mathrm{Lip},\Omega} := \sup_{x,y\in\Omega, x\neq y} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|}{|x - y|},$$

where $|\cdot|$ denotes the Euclidean norm in $\mathbb{R}^n$ or $\mathbb{R}^k$. If $|u|_{\mathrm{Lip},\Omega} < \infty$, u is called uniformly Lipschitz continuous on Ω. It is known that, for $u \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$, there is $\tilde{u} \in C^0(\Omega)$ such that $\tilde{u}(x) = u(x)$ a.e. $x \in \Omega$, in other words, we can regard $W^{1,\infty}(\Omega) \subset C^0(\Omega)$. If Ω is convex, $W^{1,\infty}(\Omega) = C^{0,1}(\overline{\Omega})$ as a subset of $C^0(\Omega)$. Moreover, if $k = 1$, we have

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} = |u|_{\mathrm{Lip},\Omega} \qquad (u \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega) \cap C^0(\Omega)).$$

In the following argument, we fix a bounded convex domain $\Omega_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ ($n \geq 2$), and we identify $W^{1,\infty}(\Omega_0, \mathbb{R}^n)$ with $C^{0,1}(\overline{\Omega_0}, \mathbb{R}^n)$.

Proposition 3.1. *Suppose that $\varphi \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega_0, \mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfies $|\varphi - \varphi_0|_{\mathrm{Lip},\Omega_0} < 1$. Then φ is a bi-Lipschitz transform from Ω_0 to $\varphi(\Omega_0)$, i.e. φ is bijective from Ω_0 onto an open set and φ and φ^{-1} are both uniformly Lipschitz continuous. Moreover, we have*

$$\operatorname*{ess\text{-}inf}_{\Omega_0} (\det \nabla\varphi^{\mathrm{T}}) \geq (1 - |\varphi - \varphi_0|_{\mathrm{Lip},\Omega_0})^n > 0. \tag{3.1}$$

where $\nabla\varphi^{\mathrm{T}}$ is the Jacobian matrix defined by

$$\nabla\varphi^{\mathrm{T}}(x) := \left(\frac{\partial\varphi_j}{\partial x_i}(x)\right)_{i\downarrow, j\rightarrow} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n} \qquad (x = (x_1, \cdots, x_n)^{\mathrm{T}} \in \Omega_0).$$

Proof. Let $\mu := \varphi - \varphi_0$ and $\theta := |\mu|_{\mathrm{Lip},\Omega_0} \in (0, 1)$. First, we show that $\varphi(\Omega_0)$ is open. We arbitrarily fix $x_0 \in \Omega_0$ and define $y_0 := \varphi(x_0)$. Let $\delta > 0$ such that $\overline{B_\delta(x_0)} \subset \Omega_0$, where $B_\delta(x_0) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n;\ |x - x_0| < \delta\}$. For $y \in B_{(1-\theta)\delta}(y_0)$, we show that $y \in \varphi(\Omega_0)$. It is easily checked that $T(\xi) := y - \mu(\xi)$ is a uniform contraction on $\overline{B_\delta(x_0)}$. From the contraction mapping theorem, there is a fixed point $x = T(x) = y - \mu(x)$ in $\overline{B_\delta(x_0)}$, that is $y = \varphi(x)$. Hence, $\varphi(\Omega_0)$ is an open set. Since $|\varphi(x_1) - \varphi(x_2)| \geq |x_1 - x_2| - |\mu(x_1) - \mu(x_2)| \geq (1 - \theta)|x_1 - x_2|$ for $x_1, x_2 \in \Omega_0$, it follows that φ is injective and φ^{-1} satisfies uniform Lipschitz condition on $\varphi(\Omega_0)$.

From Rademacher's theorem (see [4], [16]), μ is differentiable almost everywhere and the derivative coincides with the distributional derivative almost everywhere, i.e., there exists $\mathcal{N} \subset \Omega_0$ with $\mathcal{L}^n(\mathcal{N}) = 0$ such that

$$\nabla^{\mathrm{T}}\mu(x)y = \lim_{h\to 0} \frac{\mu(x + hy) - \mu(x)}{h} \qquad (x \in \Omega_0 \setminus \mathcal{N}),$$

where $\nabla^{\mathrm{T}}\mu = (\nabla\mu^{\mathrm{T}})^{\mathrm{T}}$. It follows that

$$|\nabla^{\mathrm{T}}\mu(x)y| \leq \theta\,|y| \qquad (x \in \Omega_0 \setminus \mathcal{N}),$$

and that the moduli of all the eigenvalues of $\nabla^{\mathrm{T}}\mu(x)$ for $x \in \Omega_0 \setminus \mathcal{N}$ are bounded by θ. Hence, we obtain

$$\det(\nabla^{\mathrm{T}}\varphi(x)) = \det(I + \nabla^{\mathrm{T}}\mu(x)) \geq (1 - \theta)^n \qquad (x \in \Omega_0 \setminus \mathcal{N}).$$

□

We fix an open set Ω which satisfies $\overline{\Omega} \subset \Omega_0$ and the deformed domain $\varphi(\Omega)$ is denoted by $\Omega(\varphi)$ under the condition of Proposition 3.1, hereafter. We define a pushforward operator φ_* which transforms a function v on Ω to a function $\varphi_* v := v \circ \varphi^{-1}$ on $\Omega(\varphi)$, if φ satisfies Proposition 3.1. We define

$$A(\varphi) := (\nabla \varphi^{\mathrm{T}})^{-1} \in L^\infty(\Omega_0, \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}), \quad \kappa(\varphi) := \det \nabla\varphi^{\mathrm{T}} \in L^\infty(\Omega_0, \mathbb{R}).$$

These Jacobi matrices and Jacobian appear in the pullback of differentiation and integration on $\Omega(\varphi)$ to Ω. For a function v on Ω, we have

$$[\nabla(\varphi_* v)] \circ \varphi = A(\varphi)\nabla v \quad \text{a.e in } \Omega \quad (v \in W^{1,1}(\Omega)), \tag{3.2}$$

$$\int_{\Omega(\varphi)} (\varphi_* v)(y)dy = \int_\Omega v(x)\kappa(\varphi)(x)dx \qquad (v \in L^1(\Omega)) \tag{3.3}$$

These equalities are well known in the case $\varphi \in C^1$. However, for $\varphi \in C^{0,1}$, these are not so trivial. See, [4] and [16] etc. for details. We omit the proof of the next proposition since it is clear from (3.2) and (3.3).

Proposition 3.2. *Under the condition of Proposition 3.1, for $p \in [1,\infty]$, φ_* is a linear topological isomorphism from $L^p(\Omega)$ onto $L^p(\Omega(\varphi))$, and a linear topological isomorphism from $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ onto $W^{1,p}(\Omega(\varphi))$.*

The following theorem plays an essential role in the application to the shape derivatives.

Theorem 3.3. *Let Ω be an open subset of Ω_0.*

1. $\kappa \in C^\infty(W^{1,\infty}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n), L^\infty(\Omega))$, *and* $\kappa'(\varphi_0)[\mu] = \mathrm{div}\mu$ *for* $\mu \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$.
2. $A \in C^\infty(\mathcal{O}_0(\Omega), L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}))$, *where*

$$\mathcal{O}_0(\Omega) := \{\varphi \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n);\ \text{ess-}\inf_{\Omega} \kappa(\varphi) > 0\}.$$

In particular, $A'(\varphi_0)[\mu] = -\nabla\mu^{\mathrm{T}}$ *holds for* $\mu \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$.

Proof. Since the determinant is a polynomial of degree n, it is clear that κ belongs to $C^\infty(W^{1,\infty}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n), L^\infty(\Omega))$. For fixed $\mu \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$, we define

$$m_{ij}(t) := \delta_{ij} + t\frac{\partial \mu_j}{\partial x_i} \in L^\infty(\Omega) \qquad (i, j = 1, \cdots, n,\ t \in \mathbb{R}),$$

where δ_{ij} is the Kronecker's delta. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa'(\varphi_0)[\mu] &= \left.\frac{d}{dt}\right|_{t=0} \kappa(\varphi_0 + t\mu) = \left.\frac{d}{dt}\right|_{t=0} \det(m_{ij}(t)) \\ &= \left.\frac{d}{dt}\right|_{t=0} \left(\sum_{\sigma\in S_n} \mathrm{sgn}(\sigma) m_{1\sigma(1)}(t)\cdots m_{n\sigma(n)}(t)\right) \\ &= \left.\frac{d}{dt}\right|_{t=0} (m_{11}(t)\cdots m_{nn}(t)) = \sum_{i=1}^n m_{11}(0)\cdots m'_{ii}(0)\cdots m_{nn}(0) = \mathrm{div}\mu. \end{aligned}$$

Let the (i,j) component of $A(\varphi)$ be denoted by $a_{ij}(\varphi) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Then we have $a_{ij}(\varphi) = \alpha_{ij}(\varphi)/\kappa(\varphi)$, where $\alpha_{ij}(\varphi)$ is the (i,j) cofactor of $\nabla\varphi^{\mathrm{T}}$, which is a polynomial of $\frac{\partial \varphi_k}{\partial x_l}$ of degree

$n-1$. Since $\text{ess-inf}_\Omega\, \kappa(\varphi) > 0$ for $\varphi \in \mathcal{O}_0(\Omega)$, $a_{ij} \in C^\infty(\mathcal{O}_0(\Omega), L^\infty(\Omega))$ follows. For fixed $\mu \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$, differentiating the identity

$$A(\varphi_0 + t\mu)(I + t\nabla\mu^{\mathrm{T}}) = I \qquad (I\text{: identity matrix of degree } n),$$

by $t \in \mathbb{R}$ at $t = 0$, we have

$$A'(\varphi_0)[\mu] + A(\varphi_0)\nabla\mu^{\mathrm{T}} = O.$$

Since $A(\varphi_0) = I$, we have $A'(\varphi_0)[\mu] = -\nabla\mu^{\mathrm{T}}$. □

We define an open subset of $W^{1,\infty}(\Omega_0, \mathbb{R}^n)$ as

$$\mathcal{O}(\Omega) := \left\{\varphi \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega_0, \mathbb{R}^n);\ |\varphi - \varphi_0|_{\mathrm{Lip},\Omega_0} < 1,\ \overline{\Omega(\varphi)} \subset \Omega_0\right\}. \tag{3.4}$$

Proposition 3.4. *We assume* $\mu \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega_0, \mathbb{R}^n)$ *with* $\mathrm{supp}(\mu) \subset \Omega$.

1. *If* $|\mu|_{\mathrm{Lip},\Omega_0} < 1$, *then* $\varphi = \varphi_0 + \mu$ *is a bi-Lipschitz transform from* Ω *onto itself.*
2. *For* $t \in \mathbb{R}$ *with* $|t\mu|_{\mathrm{Lip},\Omega_0} < 1$, *we define a bi-Lipschitz transform* $\varphi(t) = \varphi_0 + t\mu$ *from* Ω *to itself. Let* $l \in \{0, 1\}$ *and* $p \in [1, \infty]$. *Suppose that* $f \in W^{l,p}(\Omega)$ *if* $p \in [1, \infty)$, *and* $f \in C^l(\Omega) \cap W^{l,\infty}(\Omega)$ *if* $p = \infty$. *Then* $\varphi(t)_* f \to f$ *strongly in* $W^{l,p}(\Omega)$ *as* $t \to 0$.

Proof. From Proposition 3.1, claim 1 is clear. For claim 2, let us fix $t_0 > 0$ with $|t_0\mu|_{\mathrm{Lip},\Omega_0} < 1$. Then, from Proposition 3.2, there exist $C > 0$ such that the following inequalities hold for $|t| \le t_0$,

$$\|\varphi(t)_* f - f\|_{W^{l,p}(\Omega)} = \|\varphi(t)_*(f - f \circ \varphi(t))\|_{W^{l,p}(\Omega)} \le C\|f - f \circ \varphi(t)\|_{W^{l,p}(\Omega)}.$$

Since $[\varphi \mapsto f \circ \varphi] \in C^0(\mathcal{O}(\Omega), W^{l,p}(\Omega))$, we obtain

$$\|f - f \circ \varphi(t)\|_{W^{l,p}(\Omega)} = \|f \circ \varphi_0 - f \circ \varphi(t)\|_{W^{l,p}(\Omega)} \to 0,$$

as $t \to 0$. □

4 Potential energy in deformed domains

In this section, we consider minimization problems of an abstract potential energy in deformed domains. Some concrete examples in linear elliptic equations will be given in Section 5.

Let Ω_0 be a fixed bounded convex open set of $\mathbb{R}^n$ ($n \in \mathbb{N}$). We consider an open set Ω whose closure is contained in Ω_0. For $v \in H^1(\Omega) = W^{1,2}(\Omega)$, we introduce the following energy functional:

$$E(v, \Omega) := \int_\Omega W(x, v(x), \nabla v(x))dx,$$

where

$$W(\xi, \eta, \zeta) \in \mathbb{R} \ \text{ for } \ (\xi, \eta, \zeta) \in \Omega_0 \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n,$$

is a given energy density function. We assume some suitable regularity conditions and boundedness of its derivatives in the following argument. For simplicity, the partial derivatives of W with respect to ξ, η and ζ will be denoted by $\nabla_\xi W = (\frac{\partial W}{\partial \xi_1}, \cdots, \frac{\partial W}{\partial \xi_n})^{\mathrm{T}}$, $W_\eta = \frac{\partial W}{\partial \eta}$, and $\nabla_\zeta W = (\frac{\partial W}{\partial \zeta_1}, \cdots, \frac{\partial W}{\partial \zeta_n})^{\mathrm{T}}$, respectively. Moreover, for $v \in H^1(\Omega)$, we often write $W(v(x)) = W(x, v(x), \nabla v(x))$, $\nabla_\xi W(v(x)) = \nabla_\xi W(x, v(x), \nabla v(x))$, etc.

We consider the following minimization problem.

Problem 4.1. *Let V be a closed subspace of $H^1(\Omega)$ with $H_0^1(\Omega) \subset V \subset H^1(\Omega)$, and let $V(g) := \{v \in H^1(\Omega);\ v - g \in V\}$ for $g \in H^1(\Omega)$. For given $g \in H^1(\Omega)$, find a local minimizer u of $E(\cdot, \Omega)$ in $V(g)$, i.e. $u \in V(g)$ and there exists $\rho > 0$ such that*

$$E(u, \Omega) \le E(w, \Omega) \qquad ({}^\forall w \in V(g) \text{ with } \|w - u\|_{H^1(\Omega)} < \rho). \tag{4.1}$$

If u is a local minimizer, under suitable regularity conditions for W, formally we obtain the following variation formula:

$$\int_\Omega \{W_\eta(u(x))v(x) + \nabla_\zeta W(u(x)) \cdot \nabla v(x)\}\, dx = 0 \qquad ({}^\forall v \in V \subset H_0^1(\Omega)). \tag{4.2}$$

This implies

$$-\mathrm{div}\, [\nabla_\zeta W(u(x))] + W_\eta(u(x)) = 0 \qquad \text{in } \Omega.$$

For fixed Ω and $V \subset H^1(\Omega)$ as Problem 4.1, we consider a family of minimization problem parametrized by $\varphi \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega)$, where $\mathcal{O}(\Omega)$ is defined by (3.4). We define an affine space in $H^1(\Omega(\varphi))$:

$$V(\varphi, g) := \varphi_*(V(g)) = \{v \in H^1(\Omega(\varphi));\ \varphi_*^{-1}(v) - g \in V\} \qquad (\varphi \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega),\ g \in H^1(\Omega)).$$

Problem 4.2. *For given $\varphi \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega)$ and $g \in H^1(\Omega)$, find a local minimizer $u(\varphi)$ of $E(\cdot, \Omega(\varphi))$ in $V(\varphi, g)$, i.e. $u(\varphi) \in V(\varphi, g)$ and there exists $\rho > 0$ such that*

$$E(u(\varphi), \Omega(\varphi)) \le E(w, \Omega(\varphi)) \qquad ({}^\forall w \in V(\varphi, g) \text{ with } \|w - u(\varphi)\|_{H^1(\Omega(\varphi))} < \rho). \tag{4.3}$$

We define

$$E_*(\varphi) := E(u(\varphi), \Omega(\varphi)), \tag{4.4}$$

for a local minimizer $u_*(\varphi)$. Using the formulas (3.2) and (3.3), we define

$$\mathcal{E}(v, \varphi) := \int_\Omega W\left(\varphi(x),\ v(x),\ [A(\varphi)(x)]\nabla v(x)\right) \kappa(\varphi)(x) dx \qquad (v \in H^1(\Omega),\ \varphi \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega)), \tag{4.5}$$

then we have

$$E(\varphi_* v, \Omega(\varphi)) = \mathcal{E}(v, \varphi) \qquad (v \in H^1(\Omega)).$$

The following theorem is a direct consequence of Theorem 2.1.

Theorem 4.3. *Suppose that $\mathcal{E}$ defined by (4.5) belongs to $C^0(H^1(\Omega) \times \mathcal{O}(\Omega))$ and that $\mathcal{E}(v, \cdot) \in C^1(\mathcal{O}(\Omega))$ for $v \in H^1(\Omega)$ and $\partial_\varphi \mathcal{E} \in C^0(H^1(\Omega) \times \mathcal{O}(\Omega),\ (W^{1,\infty}(\Omega_0, \mathbb{R}^n))')$, where $\partial_\varphi \mathcal{E}$ denotes the partial Fréchet derivative of $\mathcal{E}$ with respect to $\varphi \in \mathcal{O}_0 \subset W^{1,\infty}(\Omega_0, \mathbb{R}^n)$. Let $\mathcal{U}_0 \subset V$ and $\mathcal{O}_0 \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega)$ be open subsets with $\varphi_0 \in \mathcal{O}_0$, and we define $\mathcal{U}(\varphi, g) := \varphi_*(\mathcal{U}_0 + g) \subset V(\varphi, g)$. If $u(\cdot) \in C^0(\mathcal{O}_0, H^1(\Omega))$ and $u(\varphi)$ is a global minimizer of $E(\cdot, \Omega(\varphi))$ in $\mathcal{U}(\varphi, g)$ for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{O}_0$, then we have $E_* \in C^1(\mathcal{O}_0)$ and*

$$E_*'(\varphi) = \partial_\varphi \mathcal{E}(\varphi_*^{-1} u(\varphi), \varphi).$$

In particular, we have

$$E_*'(\varphi_0) = \partial_\varphi \mathcal{E}(u(\varphi_0), \varphi_0).$$

Proof. Let $v(\varphi) := \varphi_*^{-1}u(\varphi) - g \in V$ and $\bar{\mathcal{E}}(v,\varphi) := \mathcal{E}(v+g,\varphi)$. Then $u(\varphi)$ is a local minimizer of $E(\cdot,\Omega(\varphi))$ in $V(\varphi,g)$, if and only if $v(\varphi)$ is a local minimizer of $\bar{\mathcal{E}}(\cdot,\varphi)$ in V. We apply Theorem 2.1 to $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$ and obtain $E_* \in C^1(\mathcal{O}_0)$ and

$$E_*'(\varphi) = \partial_\varphi \bar{\mathcal{E}}(v(\varphi),\varphi) = \partial_\varphi \mathcal{E}(v(\varphi)+g,\varphi) = \partial_\varphi \mathcal{E}(\varphi_*^{-1}u(\varphi),\varphi).$$

□

The minimizer $u(\varphi_0)$ is denoted by u hereafter. Under the suitable regularity conditions for $W(\xi,\eta,\zeta)$, for $\mu \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega_0,\mathbb{R}^n)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_\varphi \mathcal{E}(u,\varphi_0)[\mu] && (4.6)\\ &= \frac{d}{dt}\int_\Omega W\left(x+t\mu(x),\ u(x),\ [A(\varphi_0+t\mu)(x)]\nabla u(x)\right)\kappa(\varphi_0+t\mu)(x)dx\Big|_{t=0} \\ &= \int_\Omega \left(\nabla_\xi W(u)\cdot\mu - (\nabla_\zeta W(u))^{\mathrm{T}}(\nabla\mu^{\mathrm{T}})\nabla u + W(u)\mathrm{div}\mu\right)dx. && (4.7)\end{aligned}$$

Using the above formula, we also consider the inner variation, which is another type of variation for Problem 4.1, as follows.

Theorem 4.4. *Under the conditions of Theorem 4.3, if $u = u(\varphi_0)$ is a local minimizer of Problem 4.1, then we have*

$$\partial_\varphi \mathcal{E}(u,\varphi_0)[\mu] = 0 \qquad (\mu \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega),\ \mathrm{supp}(\mu)\subset\Omega).$$

Proof. We suppose that $\mu \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ with $\mathrm{supp}(\mu)\subset\Omega$. We define $\varphi(t) = \varphi_0 + t\mu$ for $t\in\mathbb{R}$. From Proposition 3.2 and 3.4, if $|t\mu|_{\mathrm{Lip},\Omega_0} < 1$, the corresponding pushforward operator $\varphi(t)_*$ is a linear topological isomorphism from $H^1(\Omega)$ onto itself. Moreover, from the formulas (3.2) and (3.3),

$$\lim_{t\to 0}\|\varphi(t)_* u - u\|_{H^1(\Omega)} = 0,$$

holds. Since

$$E(\varphi(t)_*u,\Omega) \geq E(u,\Omega) = E(\varphi(0)_*u,\Omega) \qquad (|t| < |\mu|_{\mathrm{Lip},\Omega_0}^{-1}),$$

we obtain

$$0 = \frac{d}{dt}E(\varphi(t)_*u,\Omega)\Big|_{t=0} = \frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{E}(u,\varphi(t))\Big|_{t=0} = \partial_\varphi\mathcal{E}(u,\varphi_0)[\mu].$$

□

5 Application to linear elliptic problems

In this section, we consider a second order linear elliptic equation with a quadratic potential energy including the anti-plane displacement model of two dimensional linear elasticity.

Example 5.1. We consider the following potential energy.

$$W(\xi,\eta,\zeta) = \frac{1}{2}\left(\zeta^{\mathrm{T}}B(\xi)\zeta + b(\xi)\eta^2\right) - f(\xi)\eta, \tag{5.1}$$

$$E(v,\Omega) = \int_\Omega \left\{\frac{1}{2}\left(\nabla^{\mathrm{T}}v\,B(x)\nabla v + b(x)v^2\right) - f(x)v\right\}dx,$$

where $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $B(\xi)$ is an $n \times n$ symmetric matrix (which is denoted by $\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}}$) and it satisfies

$$B \in C^k(\Omega_0, \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}}) \quad \text{and} \quad {}^{\exists}\beta_0 > 0 \text{ s.t. } \zeta^{\mathrm{T}} B(\xi)\zeta \geq \beta_0 |\zeta|^2 \qquad ({}^{\forall}\xi \in \Omega_0,\ {}^{\forall}\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n),$$

and

$$b \in C^k(\Omega_0, \mathbb{R}), \qquad f \in W^{k,2}(\Omega_0, \mathbb{R}), \tag{5.2}$$

with the condition $b(\xi) \geq 0$ for $\xi \in \Omega_0$. We remark that

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla_\xi W(\xi,\eta,\zeta) &= \frac{1}{2}\left(\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \nabla b_{ij}(\xi)\zeta_i\zeta_j + \nabla b(\xi)\eta^2\right) - \nabla f(\xi)\eta, \\
W_\eta(\xi,\eta,\zeta) &= b(\xi)\eta - f(\xi), \\
\nabla_\zeta W(\xi,\eta,\zeta) &= B(\xi)\zeta.
\end{aligned}$$

We suppose that Γ_D is a nonempty Lipschitz portion of $\partial\Omega$ and that a bounded trace operator $\gamma_0 :\ H^1(\Omega) \to L^2(\Gamma_D)$ is defined and

$$V := \{v \in H^1(\Omega));\ \gamma_0(v) = 0\},$$

is not empty. Then the minimization problem 4.3 corresponds to the following linear elliptic boundary value problem.

$$-\mathrm{div}(B(x)\nabla u) + b(x)u = f(x) \qquad \text{in } \Omega(\varphi),$$

$$u = g \quad \text{on } \Gamma_D, \qquad (B\nabla u)\cdot\nu = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma_D,$$

where ν is a unit normal vector on $\partial\Omega$. From the Poincaré inequality and the Lax-Milgram theorem, there exists a unique global minimizer $u(\varphi) \in V(g,\varphi)$ for $\varphi \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega)$.

Example 5.2. We consider the following potential energy which corresponds to the Poisson equation.

$$W(\xi,\eta,\zeta) = \frac{1}{2}|\zeta|^2 - f(\xi)\eta, \tag{5.3}$$

$$E(v,\Omega) = \int_\Omega \left(\frac{1}{2}|\nabla v|^2 - f(x)v\right) dx,$$

where $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $f \in W^{k,2}(\Omega_0, \mathbb{R})$. This is a special case of Example 5.1. We remark that

$$\nabla_\xi W(\xi,\eta,\zeta) = -\nabla f(\xi)\eta, \qquad W_\eta(\xi,\eta,\zeta) = -f(\xi), \qquad \nabla_\zeta W(\xi,\eta,\zeta) = \zeta.$$

Under the same boundary condition, the minimization problem 4.3 corresponds to the following boundary value problem of the Poisson equation.

$$-\Delta u = f(x) \qquad \text{in } \Omega(\varphi),$$

$$u = g \quad \text{on } \Gamma_D, \qquad \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma_D.$$

In the case of $n = 2$, this represents the anti-plane displacement model of the isotropic linear elasticity.

Lemma 5.3. *For the potential energy of Example 5.1, $\mathcal{E} \in C^k(H^1(\Omega) \times \mathcal{O}(\Omega))$ and (4.7) holds.*

Proof. In the case of Example 5.1, $\mathcal{E}$ becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}(v,\varphi) &= \int_\Omega \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left(A(\varphi)\nabla v\right)^{\mathrm{T}} B(\varphi(x)) \left(A(\varphi)\nabla v\right) + \frac{1}{2} b(\varphi(x)) v^2 - f(\varphi(x)) v \right\} \kappa(\varphi) dx \\ &= \int_\Omega \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \Psi_1(v,\varphi)(x) + \frac{1}{2}\Psi_2(v,\varphi)(x) - \Psi_3(v,\varphi)(x) \right\} \kappa(\varphi)(x) dx\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Psi_1(v,\varphi) := \left(A(\varphi)\nabla v\right)^{\mathrm{T}} (B\circ\varphi) \left(A(\varphi)\nabla v\right), \quad \Psi_2(v,\varphi) := (b\circ\varphi)v^2, \quad \Psi_3(v,\varphi) := (f\circ\varphi)v.$$

Under the assumptions, from Theorem 3.3, we obtain

$$[(v,\varphi) \mapsto A(\varphi)\nabla v] \in C^\infty(H^1(\Omega)\times\mathcal{O}(\Omega), L^2(\Omega)^n),$$

$$[\varphi \mapsto B\circ\varphi] \in C^k(\mathcal{O}(\Omega), L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^{n\times n})),$$

$$[(w,B) \mapsto w^{\mathrm{T}} B w] \in C^\infty(L^2(\Omega)^n \times L^\infty(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}), L^1(\Omega)).$$

From these regularities, it follows that $\Psi_1 \in C^k(H^1(\Omega)\times\mathcal{O}(\Omega), L^1(\Omega))$. Similarly, from the following regularities

$$[\varphi \mapsto b\circ\varphi] \in C^k(\mathcal{O}(\Omega), L^\infty(\Omega)), \quad [(b,v)\mapsto bv^2] \in C^\infty(L^\infty(\Omega)\times H^1(\Omega), L^1(\Omega)),$$

$$[\varphi \mapsto f\circ\varphi] \in C^k(\mathcal{O}(\Omega), L^2(\Omega)), \quad [(f,v)\mapsto fv] \in C^\infty(L^2(\Omega)\times H^1(\Omega), L^1(\Omega)),$$

Ψ_2 and Ψ_3 also belong to $C^k(H^1(\Omega)\times\mathcal{O}(\Omega), L^1(\Omega))$. Since $\kappa \in C^\infty(\mathcal{O}(\Omega), L^\infty(\Omega))$ from Theorem 3.3, we conclude that $\mathcal{E} \in C^k(H^1(\Omega)\times\mathcal{O}(\Omega))$. ☐

We note that if Ω satisfies the cone property, the regularity conditions (5.2) can be weakened by using the Sobolev imbedding theorem (see [1] etc.): $H^1(\Omega)$ is continuously imbedded in $L^p(\Omega)$, where $p \in [1,\infty)$ if $n=2$ and $p\in[1, 2n/(n-2)]$ if $p \geq 3$. The relaxed conditions are

$$^\exists q > 1, \quad b \in W^{k,q}(\Omega_0,\mathbb{R}), \qquad f\in W^{k,q}(\Omega_0,\mathbb{R}), \text{ if } n = 2, \tag{5.4}$$

$$b \in W^{k,\frac{n}{2}}(\Omega_0,\mathbb{R}), \qquad f \in W^{k,\frac{2n}{n+2}}(\Omega_0,\mathbb{R}), \text{ if } n\geq 3. \tag{5.5}$$

More precisely, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 5.4. *We suppose that Ω satisfies the cone property. For the potential energy of Example 5.1 with the condition* (5.4) *or* (5.5) *in stead of* (5.2)*, $\mathcal{E} \in C^k(H^1(\Omega)\times\mathcal{O}(\Omega))$ and* (4.7) *holds.*

Proof. We suppose $n=2$ and the condition (5.4). For the $q>1$ in (5.4) we define $q^* := (1-1/q)^{-1}$. From

$$[\varphi\mapsto b\circ\varphi] \in C^k(\mathcal{O}(\Omega), L^q(\Omega)), \quad [v\mapsto v] \in C^\infty(H^1(\Omega), L^{2q^*}(\Omega)),$$

$$[(b,v)\mapsto bv^2] \in C^\infty(L^q(\Omega)\times L^{2q^*}(\Omega), L^1(\Omega)),$$

$\Psi_2 \in C^k(H^1(\Omega)\times\mathcal{O}(\Omega), L^1(\Omega))$ follows. In the same way, from

$$[\varphi\mapsto f\circ\varphi] \in C^k(\mathcal{O}(\Omega), L^q(\Omega)), \quad [v\mapsto v] \in C^\infty(H^1(\Omega), L^{q^*}(\Omega)),$$

$$[(f,v)\mapsto fv]\in C^\infty(L^q(\Omega)\times L^{q^*}(\Omega),L^1(\Omega)),$$

$\Psi_3\in C^k(H^1(\Omega)\times\mathcal{O}(\Omega),L^1(\Omega))$ follows.

Next we suppose $n\geq 3$ and the condition (5.5). Put $p:=n/(n-2)$, $p^*:=(1-1/p)^{-1}=n/2$, and $(2p)^*:=(1-1/(2p))^{-1}=2n/(n+2)$. Then we have

$$[v\mapsto v]\in C^\infty(H^1(\Omega),L^{2p}(\Omega)),$$

$$[\varphi\mapsto b\circ\varphi]\in C^k(\mathcal{O}(\Omega),L^{p^*}(\Omega)),\quad [(b,v)\mapsto bv^2]\in C^\infty(L^{p^*}(\Omega)\times L^{2p}(\Omega),L^1(\Omega)),$$

$$[\varphi\mapsto f\circ\varphi]\in C^k(\mathcal{O}(\Omega),L^{(2p)^*}(\Omega)),\quad [(f,v)\mapsto fv]\in C^\infty(L^{(2p)^*}(\Omega)\times L^{2p}(\Omega),L^1(\Omega)).$$

Hence, from these regularities, we obtain $\Psi_2,\ \Psi_3\in C^k(H^1(\Omega)\times\mathcal{O}(\Omega),L^1(\Omega))$. □

We state our results under the condition (5.2) hereafter. But we remark that the following results are valid even under the condition (5.4) or (5.5) with the cone property. We obtain the following theorem from Lemma 5.3 and Theorem 2.6.

Theorem 5.5. *For the potential energy of Example 5.1, $E_*\in C^k(\mathcal{O}(\Omega))$ holds, and if $k\geq 1$ we have*

$$E'_*(\varphi_0)[\mu]=\int_\Omega(\nabla_\xi W(u)\cdot\mu-(\nabla_\zeta W(u))^{\mathrm{T}}(\nabla\mu^{\mathrm{T}})\nabla u+W(u)\mathrm{div}\mu)\,dx,$$

for $\mu\in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega_0,\mathbb{R}^n)$, where u is the global minimizer of $E(\cdot,\Omega)$ in $V(g)$. In particular, in the case of Example 5.2, we have

$$E'_*(\varphi_0)[\mu]=\int_\Omega\left\{-(\nabla f\cdot\mu)u-(\nabla^{\mathrm{T}}u)(\nabla\mu^{\mathrm{T}})(\nabla u)+\left(\frac{1}{2}|\nabla u|^2-fu\right)\mathrm{div}\mu\right\}dx,$$

for $\mu\in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega_0,\mathbb{R}^n)$.

We consider the case of Example 5.1. The global minimizer u belongs to $H^1(\Omega)$, but not to $H^2(\Omega)$ in general. The following boundary integral (5.6) is called J-integral ([11] etc.).

Theorem 5.6. *Under the assumptions in Example 5.1 with $k=1$, if there exists a sequence of subdomains $\{\Omega_l\}_l$ in which the Gauss-Green formula holds and*

$$\Omega_1\subset\Omega_2\subset\cdots\Omega\ \text{with}\ \bigcup_{l=1}^\infty\Omega_l=\Omega,$$

and if the global minimizer u belongs to $H^2(\Omega_l)$ for each $l\in\mathbb{N}$, then we have

$$E'_*(\varphi_0)[\mu]=\lim_{l\to\infty}\int_{\partial\Omega_l}\{W(u)\ \mu\cdot\nu-(\nabla_\zeta W(u)\cdot\nu)\,(\nabla u\cdot\mu)\}\,d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}_x,\tag{5.6}$$

for $\mu\in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega_0,\mathbb{R}^n)$, where ν denotes the outward unit normal of $\partial\Omega_l$ and $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}$ denotes the $n-1$ dimensional Hausdorff measure.

Proof. Under the conditions, we have

$$-\mathrm{div}\,[\nabla_\zeta W(u)]+W_\eta(u)=0\qquad\text{in }L^2(\Omega_l),$$

which is equivalent to

$$-\mathrm{div}(B\nabla u)+bu=f\qquad\text{in }L^2(\Omega_l).$$

Let us denote the Hessian matrix of u by $\nabla^2 u$. Since

$$\int_{\Omega_l} W(u(x))\mathrm{div}\mu(x)dx \;=\; \int_{\partial\Omega_l} W(u(x))\mu(x)\cdot\nu d\mathcal{H}_x^{n-1} - \int_{\Omega_l} \nabla_x[W(u(x))]\cdot\mu(x)dx,$$

$$\nabla_x[W(u(x))] = \nabla_\xi W(u(x)) + W_\eta(u(x))\nabla u(x) + [\nabla^2 u(x)]\nabla_\zeta W(u(x)),$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\Omega_l} W_\eta(u(x))\nabla u(x)\cdot\mu(x)dx &= \int_{\Omega_l} \mathrm{div}\left[\nabla_\zeta W(u)\right]\nabla u(x)\cdot\mu(x)dx \\
&= \int_{\partial\Omega_l} \left(\nabla_\zeta W(u)\cdot\nu\right)\left(\nabla u(x)\cdot\mu(x)\right)d\mathcal{H}_x^{n-1} \\
&\quad -\int_{\Omega_l} \nabla_\zeta^{\mathrm{T}} W(u)\nabla\left(\nabla u(x)\cdot\mu(x)\right)dx \\
&= \int_{\partial\Omega_l} \left(\nabla_\zeta W(u)\cdot\nu\right)\left(\nabla u(x)\cdot\mu(x)\right)d\mathcal{H}_x^{n-1} \\
&\quad -\int_{\Omega_l} \nabla_\zeta^{\mathrm{T}} W(u)\left\{(\nabla^2 u(x))\mu(x) + (\nabla\mu^{\mathrm{T}})\nabla u\right\}dx,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\Omega_l} \nabla_x[W(u(x))]\cdot\mu(x)dx &= \int_{\Omega_l} \left\{\nabla_\xi W(u(x)) + [\nabla^2 u(x)]\nabla_\zeta W(u(x))\right\}\cdot\mu(x)dx \\
&\quad \int_{\partial\Omega_l} \left(\nabla_\zeta W(u)\cdot\nu\right)\left(\nabla u(x)\cdot\mu(x)\right)d\mathcal{H}_x^{n-1} \\
&\quad -\int_{\Omega_l} \nabla_\zeta^{\mathrm{T}} W(u)\left\{(\nabla^2 u(x))\mu(x) + (\nabla\mu^{\mathrm{T}})\nabla u\right\}dx \\
&= \int_{\partial\Omega_l} \left(\nabla_\zeta W(u)\cdot\nu\right)\left(\nabla u(x)\cdot\mu(x)\right)d\mathcal{H}_x^{n-1} \\
&\quad +\int_{\Omega_l} \left\{\nabla_\xi W(u)\cdot\mu dx - \nabla_\zeta^{\mathrm{T}} W(u)(\nabla\mu^{\mathrm{T}})\nabla u\right\}dx,
\end{aligned}$$

we obtain, for $\mu \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega_0, \mathbb{R}^n)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
E'_*(\varphi_0)[\mu] &= \int_{\Omega} \left(\nabla_\xi W(u)\cdot\mu - (\nabla_\zeta W(u))^{\mathrm{T}}(\nabla\mu^{\mathrm{T}})\nabla u + W(u)\mathrm{div}\mu\right)dx \\
&= \int_{\Omega\setminus\Omega_l} \left(\nabla_\xi W(u)\cdot\mu - (\nabla_\zeta W(u))^{\mathrm{T}}(\nabla\mu^{\mathrm{T}})\nabla u + W(u)\mathrm{div}\mu\right)dx \\
&\quad +\int_{\Omega_l} \left(\nabla_\xi W(u)\cdot\mu - (\nabla_\zeta W(u))^{\mathrm{T}}(\nabla\mu^{\mathrm{T}})\nabla u\right)dx \\
&\quad +\int_{\partial\Omega_l} W(u)\ \mu\cdot\nu\ d\mathcal{H}_x^{n-1} - \int_{\Omega_l} \nabla_x[W(u)]\cdot\mu dx \\
&= \int_{\Omega\setminus\Omega_l} \left(\nabla_\xi W(u)\cdot\mu - (\nabla_\zeta W(u))^{\mathrm{T}}(\nabla\mu^{\mathrm{T}})\nabla u + W(u)\mathrm{div}\mu\right)dx \\
&\quad +\int_{\partial\Omega_l} \left\{W(u)\ \mu\cdot\nu - \left(\nabla_\zeta W(u)\cdot\nu\right)\left(\nabla u\cdot\mu\right)\right\}d\mathcal{H}_x^{n-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

The first term tends to 0 if $l \to \infty$. Hence, we have the formula (5.6). □

In particular, for the case of Example 5.2, we have

$$E'_*(\varphi_0)[\mu] \;=\; \lim_{l\to\infty}\int_{\partial\Omega_l}\left\{\left(\frac{1}{2}|\nabla u|^2 - fu\right)\ \mu\cdot\nu - (\nabla u\cdot\nu)\,(\nabla u\cdot\mu)\right\} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}_x .$$

Theorem 5.7. *Let Ω be a bounded domain with C^2-boundary. Under the condition of Example 5.2, we assume that $\Gamma_D = \partial\Omega$ with $g \equiv 0$. Then the following formula holds.*

$$E'_*(\varphi_0)[\mu] = -\frac{1}{2}\int_{\partial\Omega}|\nabla u|^2\mu\cdot\nu\ d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}_x .$$

Proof. From the regularity theorem of elliptic boundary value problems, we have $u \in H^2(\Omega)$. So, we can choose $\Omega_l = \Omega$. We remark that

$$\nabla u\cdot\mu = (\nabla u\cdot\nu)(\mu\cdot\nu), \qquad |\nabla u\cdot\nu| = |\nabla u| \qquad \text{on } \partial\Omega,$$

since u and its tangential derivatives vanish on the boundary. Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} E'_*(\varphi_0)[\mu] &= \int_{\partial\Omega}\left\{\left(\frac{1}{2}|\nabla u|^2 - fu\right)\ \mu\cdot\nu - (\nabla u\cdot\nu)\,(\nabla u\cdot\mu)\right\} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}_x \\ &= \int_{\partial\Omega}\left\{\left(\frac{1}{2}|\nabla u|^2\right)\ \mu\cdot\nu - \left(|\nabla u|^2\right)\ \mu\cdot\nu\right\} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}_x \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\int_{\partial\Omega}|\nabla u|^2\ \mu\cdot\nu\ d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}_x . \end{aligned}$$

□

This theorem can be generalized as follows.

Theorem 5.8. *Under the condition of Example 5.2, we assume that $\mu \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega_0, \mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfies*

$$\mathrm{supp}(\mu)\cap\mathrm{supp}(\ g\ |_{\overline{\Gamma_D}}) = \emptyset, \qquad \mathrm{supp}(\mu)\cap\overline{\Gamma_D}\cap\overline{\partial\Omega\setminus\Gamma_D} = \emptyset,$$

$$^{\exists}\mathcal{O}\ :\ \textit{an open set of } \mathbb{R}^n \textit{ s.t. } \mathcal{O}\supset\mathrm{supp}(\mu) \textit{ and } \partial\Omega\cap\mathcal{O} \textit{ is } C^2\textit{-class.}$$

Then the following formula holds.

$$E'_*(\varphi_0)[\mu] = -\frac{1}{2}\int_{\Gamma_D}|\nabla u|^2\mu\cdot\nu\ d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}_x - \int_{\partial\Omega\setminus\Gamma_D} f\,u\ \mu\cdot\nu\ d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}_x .$$

References

[1] R. A. Adams, Sobolev Spaces, Pure and Applied Mathematics, Vol.65, Academic Press, New York-London (1975)

[2] M. S. Berger, Nonlinearity and Functional Analysis, Lectures on nonlinear problems in mathematical analysis, Pure and Applied Mathematics. Academic Press, New York-London (1977)

[3] G. P. Cherepanov, On crack propagation in continuous media, Prikl. Math. Mekh., Vol.31, No.3, 476-493 (1967)

[4] L. C. Evans and R. F. Gariepy, Measure Theory and Fine Properties of Functions, Studies in Advanced Mathematics, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL (1992)

[5] G. A. Francfort and J.-J. Marigo, Revisiting brittle fracture as an energy minimization problem, J. Mech. Phys. Solids, Vol.46, 1319-1342 (1998)

[6] A. A. Griffith, The phenomenon of rupture and flow in solids, Phil. Trans. Royal Soc. London, A221, 163-198 (1920)

[7] D. Henry, Geometric Theory of Semilinear Parabolic Equations, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 840, Springer Verlag (1981)

[8] G. R. Irwin, Fracture dynamics, Fracturing of Metals, American Society of Metals, 147-166 (1948)

[9] M. Kimura, Shape derivative and linearization of moving boundary problems, GAKUTO International Series, Mathematical Sciences and Applications Vol.13, 167-179 (2000)

[10] K. Ohtsuka, Generalized J-integral and three-dimensional fracture mechanics I., Hiroshima Math. J., Vol.11, 21-52 (1981)

[11] K. Ohtsuka, Generalized J-integral and its applications I – Basic theory –, Japan J. Appl. Math. Vol.2, No.2, 329-350 (1985)

[12] K. Ohtsuka, Generalized J-integral and three-dimensional fracture mechanics II, Hiroshima Math. J., Vol.16, 327-352 (1986)

[13] K. Ohtsuka and A. Khludnev, Generalized J-integral method for sensitivity analysis of static shape design, Control & Cybernetics, Vol.29, 513-533 (2000)

[14] J. R. Rice, A path-independent integral and the approximate analysis of strain concentration by notches and cracks, J. Appl. Mech., Vol.35, 379-386 (1968)

[15] J. Sokolowski and J.-P. Zolesio, Introduction to Shape Optimization, Shape Sensitivity Analysis, Springer Ser. Comput. Math., Vol.16, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg (1992)

[16] W. P. Ziemer, Weakly Differentiable Functions, Sobolev Spaces and Functions of Bounded Variation. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 120, Springer-Verlag, New York (1989)